

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,974	12/29/1999	BALWINDER S. SAMRA	17207-00004	3025
7:	590 12/17/2002			
JOHN S BEULICK ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST LOUIS, MO 631022740			EXAMINER	
			VAN DOREN, BETH	
ST LOUIS, MC	031022740		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3623	
			DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/474,974	SAMRA ET AL.	1
navicery neutrin	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire by ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officianely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The apprount of the fee.	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	· ·	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	rbetter form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	3 .
NOTE: <u>New limitations were added to independe</u>		nd 23 were added.	
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NO	√ place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo		nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:	•		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examir	ner.
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		7	
		TARIO R. HAFIZ	
		ORY PATENT EXAMI	REP
		OLOGY CENTER 360	•

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with regards to claims 1-21 focus on the limitation "the targeting engine is configured to determine a sequential order for combining the models to define the target group, and combine the models in the determined sequential order". However, this limitation was added after amendment. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971)..